

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13435-US-PA
Application No.: 10/710,267

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding nonfinal Office Action mailed January 30, 2007. In this Office Action, Claims 1-8 and 12 are rejected. Applicant has amended claim 1 based on paragraph [0033] of the specification. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-8 and 12 are respectfully requested.

Discussion of Office Action Rejections

The Office Action rejected claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by applicant's admitted prior art, FIG. 1 (hereinafter AAPA).

In response to the rejection to claims 1-5, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claims 1-5 are in condition for allowance.

With respect to claim 1, as currently amended:

Claim 1 (currently amended) A method of fabricating a light guide plate, comprising the steps of:

providing a thin film having a transfer material layer thereon;

providing a molding machine having a cavity therein;

disposing the thin film inside the molding machine such that at least a portion of the transfer material layer is located within the cavity; and

forming a light guide plate body inside the cavity after the thin film is disposed inside the molding machine such that the transfer material layer is transferred on the light guide plate body from the thin film.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13435-US-PA
Application No.: 10/710,267

Applicant submits that such a method of fabricating a light guide plate as set forth in claim 1 is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by AAPA or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

AAPA fails to disclose, teach or suggest that "the light guide plate body is formed inside the cavity after the thin film is disposed inside the molding machine" and "the transfer material layer is transferred on the light guide plate body from the thin film" which are required for the method of fabricating a light guide plate as set forth in claim 1. In fact, AAPA only discloses the light guide plate is formed by performing an injection molding with utilizing molds having protrusion pattern 112. However, AAPA fails to disclose, teach or suggest that "the light guide plate is formed inside a cavity of a molding machine after any thin film is disposed inside the molding machine" and "the transfer material layer is transferred on the light guide plate body from the thin film". Accordingly, the present invention as set forth in claim 1 should not be considered as being anticipated by AAPA, and claim 1 should be allowable.

If independent claim 1 is allowable over the prior art of record, its dependent claims 2-5 are allowable as a matter of law, because these dependent claims contain all features of their respective independent claim 1. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

The Office Action rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wortman et al. US Patent 6,447,135 (hereinafter Wortman).

In response to the rejection to claim 8, Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection and submits that claim 8 is in condition for allowance.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13435-US-PA
Application No.: 10/710,267

With respect to previously presented claim 8:

Claim 8. A light guide plate, comprising:

a light guide plate body having a light output surface, a bottom surface, at least a light incident surface and a plurality of side surfaces, wherein the light incident surface and the side surfaces are adjacent to and positioned between the bottom surface and the light output surface; and

a transfer material layer disposed on the bottom surface, the transfer material layer comprises:

a light-scattering patterned layer disposed on the bottom surface; and

a light-reflecting layer disposed over the bottom surface and covering the light-scattering patterned layer, wherein the transfer material layer and the light guide plate body are formed into a unity, and there is substantially no gap between the transfer material layer and the light guide plate body.

Applicant submits that such a light guide plate as set forth in claim 8 is neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Wortman or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Wortman fails to disclose, teach or suggest that the transfer material layer comprises both of a light-scattering patterned layer and a light-reflecting layer. In fact, Wortman only discloses "A pattern of adhesive 78 is formed, such as by pattern transfer, onto the reflector 76," (Column 5, lines 19-20). Otherwise, Wortman discloses "the adhesive 78 is used to directly secure the reflector 76 to the back surface 70 of the

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13435-US-PA
Application No.: 10/710,267

lightguide 68"(Column 5, lines 20-22), "the reflector 76 is directly secured to the lightguide 74 by a continuous layer of adhesive 73"(Column 5, lines 49-51) and "the reflector 26 may be formed on the back surface 20 using a deposition process" (Column 3, lines 55-56). Namely, Wortman fails to disclose, teach or suggest that the reflector 76 can be the transfer material layer.

Accordingly, the present invention as set forth in claim 8 should not be considered as being anticipated by Wortman, and claim 8 should be allowable.

The Office Action also rejected claims 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ayres US Patent 5,947,578 (hereinafter Ayres) and claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wortman in view of Wimberger-Friedl US Patent 5,845,035 (hereinafter Wimberger-Friedl).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ayres and claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wortman in view of Wimberger-Friedl because a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the Office Action.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), each of three requirements must be met. First, the reference or references, taken alone or combined, must teach or suggest each and every element in the claims. Second, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skilled in the art, to combine the references in a manner resulting in the claimed invention. Third, a reasonable expectation of success must exist. Moreover, each of the three requirements must "be

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13435-US-PA
Application No.: 10/710,267

found in the prior art, and not be based on applicant's disclosure." See M.P.E.P. 2143, 8th ed., February 2003.

As described in the above discussion, AAPA fails to disclose, teach or suggest that "the light guide plate body is formed inside the cavity after the thin film is disposed inside the molding machine" and "the transfer material layer is transferred on the light guide plate body from the thin film" which are required for the method of fabricating a light guide plate as set forth in claim 1. Meanwhile, Ayres fails to disclose, teach or suggest the same features. Therefore, Applicant submits a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the Office Action since not each and every step or element in claims 6 and 7 has been taught or suggested by AAPA and Ayres.

Accordingly, the claims 6 and 7 of the present invention should not be considered as unpatentable over AAPA in view of Ayres, and claims 6 and 7 should be allowable.

Moreover, as described in the above discussion, Wortman fails to disclose, teach or suggest that the transfer material layer comprises both of a light-scattering patterned layer and a light-reflecting layer. Meanwhile, Wimberger-Friedl fails to disclose, teach or suggest the same feature. Therefore, Applicant submits a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the Office Action since not each and every element in claim 12 has been taught or suggested by Wortman and Wimberger-Friedl.

Accordingly, the claim 12 of the present invention should not be considered as unpatentable over Wortman in view of Wimberger-Friedl, and claim 12 should be allowable.

Customer No.: 31561
Docket No.: 13435-US-PA
Application No.: 10/710,267

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all pending claims 1-8 and 12 are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Date :

April 27, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Belinda Lee
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw

Page 10 of 10